DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 196 514 PS 011 301

AUTHOR Grotberg, Edith H.
TITLE The Federal Role in Parenting.
INSTITUTION ERIC Clearinghouse on Elementary and Early Childhood Education, Urbana, Ill.: Memphis State Univ., Tenn.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Dec 80
CONTRACT 400-78-0008
NOTE 16p.: Paper presented at the Symposium on Parenting, Memphis State University (Memphis, TN, March 26, 1979).
AVAILABLE FROM In "Parenthood in a Changing Society" available from: ERIC Clearinghouse on Elementary and Early Childhood Education, College of Education, University of Illinois, 1310 South Sixth Street, Champaign, IL 61820 (Catalog No. 190, $5.00)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Child Advocacy; *Family Programs; Federal Aid; *Federal Government; Federal Regulation; *Government Role; *Parent Education; Political Issues; Public Policy
IDENTIFIERS Child Care Legislation; *Parenting; Project Head Start

ABSTRACT

This symposium paper discusses ways the federal government is and has been involved in parenting since the foundation of the nation. Included in this discussion are the federal role in funding research related to families and parenting; family research conducted by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (DHEW); the National Institute of Education's (NIE) conference on Parents as Educators; the effect of the Head Start program on families; the historical involvement of the federal government in protecting the rights of parents to rear their children; public policy and parenting; and pending legislation affecting parenting. A detailed description of the Child Care Bill (1979) is also presented. (Author/MP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED196514

The Federal Role in Parenting*

Edith H. Grotberg, Ph.D.

Director, Research, Demonstration and Evaluation Division
Administration for Children, Youth and Families
Department of Health, Education and Welfare**

The notion that the federal government has or should have a role in parenting concerns many groups and individuals, among them parents, in a number of ways. Some want more federal involvement and support of families and parents; others want nothing from the government which might be perceived as invasion of privacy or interference with parental rights. Some advocate federal plans and laws pertaining to families modeled after those of western European countries; others advocate developing policies relating to families which reflect the American values of participation, privacy, choice and respect for family differences.

Federal legislation, policy and regulation have always affected families and parenting. What is new is a greater awareness of the interrelatedness and interdependency of laws and policies with families and parenting. In addition, there is an increased sensitivity to the needs of families as units, as distinct from an emphasis on the needs of individual family members reflected in the past tendency to remove children from their families whenever difficulties arose. Also new is the awareness that parents have rights, that they must be involved in decisions affecting their parenting role and that they should be involved in program service development and performance.

This paper will describe a number of ways the federal government is and has been involved in parenting. It will trace some of the nation's guiding principle and values as these have changed over the years or have persisted. Finally, it will explore a few current projects on family policies and will describe in some detail the pending Child Care Act which attempts to incorporate all that has been learned about the federal role in parenting as well as to meet pressing needs of parents. We will begin with a newspaper report on federally funded research.

Research and Protection of Subjects

The newspapers on Saturday, March 17, 1979, contained a report from a Federal Ethics Advisory Board concerning the study of human

---

* Presented March 26, 1979.

**Endorsement by the Administration for Children, Youth and Families is not implied and should not be inferred. The name of the department has been changed to Health and Human Services.

PS 011301

life in the laboratory. The Board recommended that the government end a long moratorium on funding of any efforts to start human life in the laboratory. It also voted to advise the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare that both basic research and the actual creation of life in the form of embryos started in the laboratory are ethically acceptable, if the final goal is to produce children for husbands and wives who are otherwise unable to produce them.

This Federal Board, in effect, is making recommendations that may well determine if some adults can ever become parents. The Board is comprised of doctors, scientists, religious and ethical representatives and other citizens appointed by the Secretary of DHEW. It acts as a neutral, impartial body not controlled by researchers or federal agencies or groups with special interest in the issue. Congress, which had put a ban on fetal research in 1974 and removed it for some research in 1975, permitted DHEW to form the Board to determine what additional kinds of fetal research are permissible. How else should an issue as fundamental to future parents of the nation be handled?

The federal government is also involved in protecting parents and children in the conduct of research and in regulating the availability of information on parents and children. The federal government supports most of the research being conducted in the nation and has done so since the early 1960s. The amount of money devoted to research increased steadily until the past few years, when it leveled off. At first there was a laissez-faire attitude toward researchers which relied heavily on the ethics of the various professions to assure proper behavior in conducting research. But during the 1960s, when research money for education, biomedical and behavioral sciences made quantum leaps and much of the research in education and other behavioral sciences affected large numbers of citizens, the picture changed. Parent groups began to resist having their children or themselves used as research subjects. Much of their resentment concerned use of research data to place children in special classes, use of tests which seemed to mitigate against children from minority groups, and lack of confidentiality of information or protection of privacy. Advocacy groups for citizens also resisted much of the research being conducted. Law suits abounded and many have not yet been resolved.

The federal government responded to these concerns by acting as a mediator among the groups involved. The Privacy Act of 1974 and the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act, a section (438) of the Educational Amendments Act of 1974, were responses to the public complaints. A further response was the National Research Act (P.L. 93-348) also passed in 1974. The Privacy Acts and the Family Rights Act must be considered when conducting research, but the National Research Act is primarily concerned with the protection of parents and children in research under the caption, "subjects at risk".

The National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research, established by the National Research Act, has provided leadership in stating policies and guidelines to assure the protection of research subjects. In many instances these policies and guidelines have become regulations. To date the Com-

mission's work has been primarily with DHEW, although evidence suggests that its responsibility will widen to include all federal executive departments. The two questions the Commission asks of DHEW components are these:

1. Does your component of DHEW or any elements thereof conduct or support any biomedical or behavioral research involving human subjects?

2. If such research is conducted or supported, what policies and procedures are enforced to assure the protection of human subjects?

These questions provided the basis for the May, 1974 regulations which included the requirement for local review boards.

The 1974 regulations require that a review committee or group be established in each institution submitting a proposal for federal funding of research. This committee or group, increasingly referred to as the Institutional Review Board (IRB), is responsible for reviewing proposals to be submitted to determine if there are "subjects at risk." Members of the IRB must interpret the definition of "subjects at risk" in order to make a decision. They cannot avoid doing so since each institution is required to address the problem. Each institution involved is required to fill out a form stating it has such a committee and must certify that each proposal has been reviewed and a decision made about whether research subjects are at risk. The review process is what is mandated by the regulations. However, in the July 21, 1978 regulations concerning children as research subjects, further guidelines are provided about what should be included in the review process. In the Summary section of the issuance are these guidelines:

> The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (DHEW) is proposing regulations to implement the recommendations on research involving children of the National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research. Key provisions require that such research be carried out only if the research methods are appropriate, the investigators competent, the facilities adequate, and the research procedures designed to contribute vitally to generalizable knowledge. Risks must be minimized, and the research performed in connection with necessary diagnosis and treatment wherever possible. Adequate provisions must be made to obtain the assent of the child and the consent or permission of the parents or guardians whenever these are necessary.[1]

These 1978 regulations are still classified as Proposed Rules, which means comments can still be made by the public. However, the regulations have already benefited from public hearings and will probably require little change.

The role assumed by the federal government is to engage impartial individuals or groups, such as the Commission members or local Institutional Review Boards, to make determinations of when a subject is at risk. The procedure for protecting the subjects and guaranteeing informed consent may be determined by the local groups.

Family Research and Parenting

Funding research is a major role of the federal government on issues of parenting. Few object to this role, and many feel there should be more research, better dissemination of findings, and more utilization of research in legislation. A recent publication of the Education Commission of the States (ECS), entitled Families and Schools: Implementing Parent Education[2] reports on an April 1978 conference to consider the feasibility of implementing parent education in the public schools. Among the concerns discussed were the appropriate roles of the federal, state and local levels of government. The participants at this conference, funded by the Office of Education, the Administration for Children, Youth and Families (ACYF) and ECS, were non-government professionals. Among their conclusions was this:

> There was general agreement that this is not the time for the federal government to pour massive amounts of money into programs and services -nor is such an action likely, given the current priorities of the Administration and Congress. What is needed most at this time is research and development to sort out the evidence on what programs work, where they can be replicated, under what conditions at what cost and for what sort of clientele. Paralleling such an effort, the use of pilot programs, with an emphasis on local initiative and on the training of professionals, appears to be the most productive contribution that the federal government could make at this time. The conference participants were unanimous in feeling that federal agencies and Congress could be most helpful by providing incentives and reliable data on programs that work, rather than by prescribing uniform policy and service requirements.
>
> Whatever happens in the state capitals and alongside the Potomac, local communities will shoulder the major responsibility if parent education is to become a reality in their school systems. The conference participants agreed that planning and coordination are essential at this level. There must be that tight network of cooperative relationships that is the key to bringing any idea to fruition within the institutional setting of the schools. There must also be a consensus on goals that will satisfy the social needs of the community, and these will differ from one community to another. It goes without saying that diversity in program design is essential, but all programs must be based upon an accurate reading of the developmental needs of the family. Institutional flexibility is likewise essential, but the school should, as one participant phrased it, keep their claims

modest because there is much that they do not know about the interaction of parents and children.

The concept of parent education suggests that the entire family as a unit, rather than merely the child who attends school, is the primary client of public schools in America. Families and schools, according to this reasoning, should enter into a closer partnership of the rearing and education of children.[3]

Federal Activities and Parenting

Family Research: ACYF: ACYF is particulary supportive of family research which not only studies family styles and needs, but also seeks methods supporting families and helping them perform their parenting roles. ACYF postulates that professional services must be available as needed, but they should not substitute for the family or ignore the family in favor of individual members except under very special circumstances. Rather than relying on professionals to provide services and information, parents should be encouraged to form mutual support groups and to use available information to help them in their responsibilities.

In a special issue of Children Today (March-April, 1978) ACYF summarized its family research:

> In 1974 the Office of Child Development - now the Administration for Children, Youth and Families - began a 5 part research effort centering on the family as a focal point for research bearing on child development. During the first two phases of the effort, ACYF supported research projects which looked at child development within different types of families - among them, one-parent families, minority families, low-income families and families in which both parents work. Research projects also examined the interaction of families with community services, schools and other institutions. Television was studied both within the family system and as part of the institutional system.
>
> Now, in the third phase, ACYF is supporting pilot studies to test the kinds of changes in services and interventions needed to enhance child development and improve interaction between families and institutions. Full-scale demonstrations or promising programs will be supported in the next phase.
>
> Finally, the knowledge derived from these and other studies will be used to design new programs and policies to meet the needs of children and families and to provide guidance for existing ACYF programs.
>
> ACYF is also funding a series of projects which will look at ways to communicate scientific knowledge about child development to different types of families, examine the kinds

of information that families have and need on child development and its impact on childrearing, and study ways to make information on supportive services more accessible.

In addition, the Children's Bureau, ACYF, supports demonstration projects that are attempting to prevent foster placement of children by providing comprehensive services to families under stress. The use of social service contracts between agencies and families to improve case planning is being tested in other projects.

Demonstration projects that provide comprehensive services to abused and neglected children and their families, and research projects that are exploring factors contributing to child abuse and neglect and promising prevention and treatment techniques are supported by the National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect in the Children's Bureau.[4]

Parents as Educators: NIE: The National Institute of Education of DHEW held a Conference on Parents as Educators in November 1978, at the request of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Secretary required a review of the current state of knowledge with respect to research on and programs of parent education, and the direction that new programs and materials for parent education might take. The request coincided with the raising of somewhat broader questions at the National Institute of Education concerning the areas in which research on families as educators might be developed, with respect to both educational policy and the role of the family as a source of learning. Because of the necessary relationship between parents as educators and the familial and broader community context in which parental educational efforts occur, the conference necessarily focused on the broader question of the relationship between parents and the school. Throughout the discussion the Institute's concern with equity and the improvement of local educational practice were also considered.

The NIE conference included the presentation of formal papers, a systematic panel discussion of these papers, and finally an informal discussion among the conference participants and observers. The papers (in the order in which they were given) were 1) Steven Schlossman, "Family as Educator, Parent Education, and the Perennial Family Crisis" (discussed by Robert Hill and Luis Laosa); 2) Robert Boger, Richard Richter, Beatrice Paloucci, Sylvia Whitmer, "Parent as Teacher: Perspective of Function and Context" (discussed by Jacqueline Jackson and Barbara Finkelstein); 3) Beresford Hayward, "The Educational Role of the Family" (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development Research Proposal); 4) Carol Stack, "Parenting and Family Impact," (discussed by Evelyn Moore and Luis Laosa); 5) James P. Comer, "Relationships Between the School and the Family" (discussed by Laura Lein and Robert Hill); 6) Joan Bergstrom and Irving Lazar, "Curriculum Materials for the Family as Faculty" (discussed by Steven Hamilton and Noel Day).

In a synthesis and summary of the conference, Hope Leichter described the focus.

The participants in the NIE conference were all concerned with research on the family as educator, but they worked in a variety of institutional settings, including academic departments in universities, schools of education, and institutes and centers concerned with policy and programs related to the family, both within the United States and abroad. This diversity of professional position and experience, along with the diversity of personal backgrounds, represented a significant resource for the conference, indicating as it did the variety of locations in which serious concern with the family and familial education can be found.

The purpose of the conference was to consider our knowledge of parents, or, more broadly, families, as educators, with respect to the issue of what we know already about families as educators and what we need to know. The essential focus was thus on research questions concerning families as educators, but the discussants dealt with issues of both how families serve as teaching and learning environments and how research on families as educators is related to concerns about policy and programming.

The conference participants did not seek to make specific recommendations with respect to particular research projects, but rather to review the art and science of research on the family as a background from which the staff of NIE could develop more specific recommendations with respect to research goals and priorities.

Through the examination of the two agenda-setting volumes, the formal presentation of papers, the formal discussion of these papers, and the general discussion that followed, five topics emerged as issues that must be considered in appraising our understanding of families as educators:

1. the need for continual scrutiny of underlying professional assumptions about families as educators;

2. the domain of research on families as educators;

3. the theoretical and conceptual frameworks appropriate for research on families as educators;

4. the methodologies best suited to research on families as educators;

5. the relation of research to program and policy.[5]

Program Impact on Families: Head Start: The Secretary of DHEW requested information on how the Head Start program relates to and affects families. This 1978 request was responded to by the Administration for Children, Youth and Families in an analytical paper written by Dr. Ann O'Keefe, an ACYF staff member. The highlights of her

Executive Summary provide the salient information on the role of a Federal program in parenting.

"Head Start Is Building Families." Although this was the theme of a recent national Head Start Association conference, it might surprise many a "man on the street" who still views Head Start at best solely as a preschool educational program for poor children. However, the fact is that the Head Start program was conceived and implemented from its earliest moments as a broad comprehensive program which, while providing educational, health and social services to low income children, would do so in the context of the child's family and would emphasize parent involvement and participation in all aspects of the program. Parents have always had a key role in Head Start, and Head Start has served and worked with parents and families of enrolled children from the very beginning.

The Cooke memo of 1965, which outlined the philosophical foundation of Head Start, directed attention to the child within the context of the family and community. Indeed, one of the memo's recommendations was that parents participate in Head Start by planning programs, participating in parent education programs, participating in their children's classrooms, serving as a link between children, staff and neighborhood, and filling appropriate job roles in the program. This emphasis on parent involvement was based on the evidence at hand which in recent years has been even further supported--that the greater the parent involvement, the greater the benefits that accrue to the children themselves.

In 1972, a giant programmatic step was taken with the issuance of the Head Start Program Performance Standards. All of the program component areas outlined in the Standards--education, health, social services and, of course, parent involvement--address the role of Head Start parents. Thus, program objectives related to parents and families permeate the entire Head Start program.

There is considerable evidence showing how Head Start is actively involving parents, families and communities, as mandated by the program requirements (although much more needs to be learned about the "invisible" kinds of involvement that may be meaningful to individual parents and families). Parents are an integral part of the decision-making process and comprise a majority of each local Head Start policy council. They are part of the staff hiring (and firing) process, the program self-assessment teams, and the program-planning process--to name only a few of the general areas of parent participation in the decisions which affect the operation of their local Head Start program.

> Parents are also offered innumerable opportunities within Head Start to strengthen and further develop their understanding and skill as parents. These opportunities include conferences with Head Start staff, parent meetings and discussion groups, suggestions on how to capitalize on the home as a learning environment and how to follow up at home on the activities which are begun at the center.[6]

Head Start has developed and supported a number of programs which give primary emphasis to activities supportive of parents in their parenting roles. Two of these are Home Start and the Child and Family Resource Program (CFRP). O'Keefe summarizes their impact on parenting.

> The 16-program Home Start demonstration was funded for 3½ years (1972-1975) to evaluate the feasibility of providing comprehensive Head Start services through a Home Visitor. Home Visitors were trained to work with parents in their own homes, to help them do with and provide for their own children the same kinds of activities, experiences and services provided in center-based programs.
>
> The Home Start evaluation provided clear evidence of the feasibility of the Home Start approach and showed that the outcomes for children and parents were comparable to the outcomes obtained by participants in Head Start center-based programs.
>
> Currently the Home Start approach is available throughout the Head Start program via the "home-based option" and about 400 Head Start programs are serving a total of about 20,000 children through such a program option. (Virtually all children in a home-based option have a regular group experience, usually weekly, in additon to their regular home visits.)
>
> The Home Start demonstration program and the current home-based options provide perhaps the best evidence of the general feasibility of intensive parent-participatory programs within the Head Start context.
>
> The Child and Family Resource Program (CFRP) was launched in 1973 in 11 diverse locations and is scheduled to continue through 1984. It is a family service/support program with emphasis on promoting the healthy growth and development of the young children in the family, from the prenatal stage through third grade.
>
> One of the key elements of the CFRP is the family assessment, which results in a Family Action Plan laying out specific services and supports needed by the family as a whole (as well as by individual family members).

The backbone of the CFRP staff is the family advocate who, working closely with his/her families, makes sure that appropriate services are provided to families on a continuing basis, as old needs are met and new ones emerge.

There is considerable evidence that CFRP is having a favorable, constructive impact on community resource/service agencies. There is also evidence of strengthening in overall family functioning with regard to home environment, safety, health care and housing.[7]

Historical Involvement of the Federal Government

The federal government has been involved with parenting in one form or another since the formation of the nation. Rural families received, and continue to receive information and services concerning parenting through the Agriculture Extension Programs. These programs, combining as they do federal, state and county support and involvement, include home visiting, parent education, crisis service and opportunities for future homemakers and parents. The Preventive Services sponsored by the federal government have included prevention of child abuse and neglect, prevention of parents' exploiting their children for labor, and prevention of social agencies' breaking up families by removing children when it is not absolutely necessary to do so. Maternal and child health services have been available for more than 50 years as have other family support services.

In reviewing the child welfare policies of the nation over a 200 year period, Lois-ellin Datta, a staff member of NIE, succinctly summarized the changes as follows:

> Child welfare policies have changed, obviously, in the past two hundred years. They have expanded, contracted, and re-defined the population served along five dimensions:
>
> focus: public concern began with the food, shelter, clothing and education of orphaned, destitute, indigent children (economic problems). It has expanded to include the psychological welfare of poor children as well as the emotional health and safety of children whose parents have enough money to provide for their physical needs,
>
> responsibility: paying for child welfare has expanded from mostly parish, private citizen, charity organization, or municipal monies to a larger proportion of funds from state and federal governments,
>
> strategy: approaches have expanded from direct action on or with the individual child such as indenture or placement in orphanages to indirect and preventive action such as income maintenance and parent education programs,

tactics: the approaches have shifted (not expanded) from punishment of mothers bearing illegitimate children and removal of poor children from their families to income maintenance. A cushion of public funds helps many poor but otherwise competent families care for their children. Public policy includes an emphasis on strengthening the family's ability to care for children in their own homes and integrating children with special needs into the community,

oversight: accountability has changed from primarily oversight by parish, private citizen, charity organization, and municipal committees to establishment of national and state standards for child welfare services, and development of professional organizations concerned with expansion and quality of child welfare. Unchanged, however, is the role of individuals whose eloquence and evidence catalyze public reform on behalf of children.[8]

Public Policy and Parenting

The federal government formulates many policies which, while not necessarily addressing the family directly, have an impact on families and their parenting role. These policies include tax benefits for child care costs, ability to use public funds to pay relatives for child care, inclusion of men as qualifying for Aid to Families with Dependent Children, assistance in locating services and resources, and provision of educational services to handicapped children and their parents. Policies on foster care and adoption, services to teenaged pregnant girls and teenaged parents, and even interest rates for building loans affect families and parenting. Of increasing interest are questions of how other federal policies affect families, how policies are formed, and what family policies are needed to promote parenting.

ACYF is addressing these policy issues in a number of ways. One involves supporting a project at the National Academy of Science which is studying how policies affecting families are made. The hope is to identify critical decision points and times at which input of information or data would be useful. Another is a project with the Family Impact Seminar which is examining the impact of various policies on families in a number of states. From this, analysts hope to identify some useful instruments which would help states assess the impact of federal, state and local policies on families. A third project, conducted by the National Congress of Parents and Teachers is attempting to formulate a framework for policies which affect families by involving parents in discussions across the country.

In this third project, the technique being used to involve parents in policy discussions is the distribution of "Issue Packets", which are intended to familiarize parents and others with the issues to be discussed. With support from the Administration for Children, Youth and Families, the project staff developed a set of ten Issue Packets[9], each

addressing a topic that is both important to parents and relevant to policy. The range of topics includes TV Advertising and Parental Authority, Preparing Children for Family Life, Violence in the Family, Stresses in Marriage and Family Life, and Child Care for Working Parents. Using one of these packets -Preparing Children for Family Life - as an illustration one can see how parents might become involved in helping to shape policies relating to families.

The Issue Packet first presents some background information about changing family responsibilities, size, structure and relationships. Second it offers information on what schools have historically done to educate children for family life. School programs include high school home economics courses, Education for Parenthood projects supported by ACYF, and Head Start and infant stimulation programs. The discussion then addresses the question: What needs to be considered in developing a family life education program? Finally, the major issues for discussion are presented. These are: 1) Responsibility; 2) At what age should family life education be taught? and 3) How should information on parenthood and family life be presented? The specific choices which may be considered in discussion are presented under each issue.

Each PTA Unit which chooses this packet to discuss at meetings is asked to fill out a prepared form which, in effect, provides a voting record of the choices made around the three isues identified. This information is sent to PTA national headquarters where analyses are made. The results are used to determine the wishes and views of parents so that they can be reflected in policies.

Pending Legislation Affecting Parenting

One final example of the federal role in parenting is in the Child Care Act of 1979. The bill (S4), introduced into the 96th Congress in January, is being discussed in the Human Resources Subcommittee on Child and Human Development of the Senate, chaired by Senator Alan Cranston of California. The bill intends to respond to current needs of working parents and attempts to draw on all the past knowledge and experience accrued in the nation to assure state, local and parent involvement in carrying out the Act. The general purposes of the bill are:

(1) to provide assistance to States in improving the quality of and coordination among child-care programs and provide additional resources for child-care services;

(2) to provide mechanisms for assessing the extent of the need for child-care services in the Nation;

(3) to promote coordination at all governmental levels of child-care programs and other services for children and their families;

(4) to promote the availability and diversity of quality child-care services for all children and families who need such services;

(5) to provide assistance to families whose financial resources are insufficient to pay the full cost of necessary child-care services; and

(6) to strengthen the functioning of families by seeking to assure that parents are not forced by lack of available programs or financial resources to place a child in an undesirable care facility or arrangement. (Child Care Act of 1979, pp. 3-4.)

Specifically, the bill provides financial aid to states to establish child care information and referral services, training facilities for child-care personnel, and procedures for state licensing of child care facilities. It gives authority to the Secretary of HEW to "make grants to and enter into contracts with public agencies and private organizations to support innovative, demonstration child-care projects," such as nighttime care and care for sick children, migrant children and handicapped children. It requires the Secretary to review and evaluate such projects and other activities of the Act and to conduct studies of child-care needs.

Among other provisions, it requires the establishment of state and national advisory panels on child care needs and services. In order to promote "meaningful" parental involvement in the planning, monitoring and evaluation of child care services, each panel must be comprised of at least 25% parents of children receiving child-care services under the Act.

The bill authorizes appropriation of funds deemed "necessary" for fiscal 1980 and each of the following four fiscal years. Of these funds, 75% would be allocated to providers for operating day care programs and up to 10% could be used for administrative purposes. Funds are mandated to be used to supplement and not supplant existing Federal funds "used for the support of child-care services and related programs."

An excellent summary of what the bill's policies would do was made in the January 29, 1979, issue of Day Care and Child Development Reports[10]. The article includes an awareness of all the concerns which have been expressed over the years about a child care program and highlights how the Child Care Act addresses them.*

Summary and Concluding Statement

The federal government has played and will continue to play a role in parenting. This is inevitable, as the government provides family services to citizens directly or through state and local agencies. The services inevitably address problems of parenting because of the major role the family plays in child rearing. When the family is under great stress, outside help is needed and public moneys are used to provide this help.

---

*Note: The bill was not passed.

Research and demonstration programs generate new knowledge and models for the benefit of public and private service providers. The development of parenting education materials has been supported by the federal government as have a variety of procedures for helping parents meet, share experiences, and address their common problems in child rearing. The government must have standards not only to ensure quality in services but also to protect human subjects in research. This protection includes informed parental consent and informed child assent to participate in research.

No level of government has the right to tell parents how to rear their children, but the government can make a variety of information and services available to parents so that they are able to select what is most consistent with their values and goals. The government must examine its policies to determine what it is doing to support or weaken families and must be certain to respect the family as the basic and primary institution in which child rearing occurs. In this International Year of the Child (1979), we must all become more sensitive to the needs of children and their families and provide the necessary help and supports for effective parenting.

Footnotes

1. Federal Register: Proposed Rules Concerning Children as Research Subjects, Summary Section. July 21, 1978.

2. Education Commission of the States, Families and Schools: Implementing Parent Education. Report No. 121 (ED 165 900, 54 pp.), pp. xii-xiii, January, 1979.

3. Ibid., pp. xii-xiii.

4. Grotberg, Edith H. ACYF Family Research. Children Today, March-April 1978, p. 9.

5. Leichter, Hope Jensen. Report on Conference on Parents as Educators. National Institute of Education, November 19-21, 1978.

6. O'Keefe, Ann. What Head Start Means to Families. Administration for Children, Youth and Families, DHEW, 1978 (ED 161 525, 72 pp.), pp. iii-iv.

7. Ibid., pp. vi-vii.

8. Watchman, Lois-ellin Datta. How Is It With the Child? Some Aspects of Child Welfare Policy from 1776-1976. In Edith H. Grotberg (editor), 200 Years of Children (ED 136 948, 490 pp.), pp. 221-283, 1977.

9. Parent and Teachers Association and Cornell University College of Human Ecology, Preparing Children for Family Life. Issue Packet No. 8, 1978.

10. Day Care and Child Development Reports. Volume 8, Number 2, January 29, 1979, pp. 7-9.